

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry this amendment, claims 1-25 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1 and 23 are independent.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed on July 12, 2004.

In connection with the next Office action, applicants request that the Examiner consider the three Information Disclosure Statements that were filed on February 18, 2004, July 12, 2004, and December 21, 2004.

Claims 1-25 are presented to the Examiner for further prosecution on the merits.

A. Asserted Anticipation Rejection

In the outstanding Office action, mailed June 13, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,762,126 to Cho et al. ("the Cho et al. reference"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner asserted that the Cho et al. reference anticipates independent claim 1, relying on claim 1 of the Cho et al. reference. *Office action mailed June 13, 2005, at page 2.* However, neither claim 1 of the Cho et al. reference, nor the Cho et al. reference as a whole, disclose each and every element of claim 1 of the pending application. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Applicants note, for example, the Cho et al. reference fails to disclose, or even suggest, "maintaining a loading temperature of a furnace into which the substrate will be loaded at about 500°C or less," as recited in claim 1.

Similarly, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of anticipation in the rejection of independent claim 23. Claim 23 recites

numerous elements which the rejection fails to discuss, and applicants respectfully submit that the Cho et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest these claim elements. For example, like claim 1, claim 23 recites “maintaining a loading temperature of a furnace into which the substrate will be loaded at about 500°C or less.” Claim 23 also recites, *inter alia*, “loading the substrate into the furnace and increasing the temperature of the furnace by about 7±3°C/min,” which is likewise not disclosed by the Cho et al. reference.

Finally, regarding the rejections of the remaining claims, applicants note that many of the rejections asserted by the Examiner are completely unsupported by the Cho et al. reference. For example, the Examiner rejected claim 2, yet the Office action fails to state where the Cho et al. reference discloses the claimed subject matter and, in fact, the Cho et al. reference fails to disclose an edge bead removal, as recited by claim 2. Also, the Examiner rejected claim 8, yet references material which is apparently irrelevant. Claim 8 recites “further comprising increasing a temperature in the furnace by about 7±3°C/min after loading the substrate into the furnace.” The Examiner asserted that this is disclosed at column 6, lines 25-27. *Office action mailed June 13, 2005, at pages 3-4.* However, the cited lines in the Cho et al. reference do not disclose a temperature increase rate for a furnace of about 7±3°C/min and, in fact, the Cho et al. reference fails to disclose any furnace heating rates whatsoever.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), since the Cho et al. reference fails to suggest, much less disclose, all elements of claim 1-25. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

B. Conclusion


Since the cited prior art relied on to reject the claims of the subject application fails to anticipate or render obvious the present invention, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-25 are now in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 6, 2005


Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

LEE & MORSE, P.C.
1101 WILSON BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703.525.0978 TEL
703.525.4265 FAX

PETITION and
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.